



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,648	03/28/2006	Agostino Lauria	2501-1013	8971
<div>466 7590 09/09/2009</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314</div>				
EXAMINER				
KATCHEVES, BASIL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3635				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/573,648

Applicant(s)

LAURIA ET AL.

Examiner

BASIL KATCHEVES

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This supplemental non final office action is necessitated by the examiner acting upon the claims dated 6/18/08 which were 1-13. However, the claims dated 3/26/06 were the amended new claims 14-26. These claims, 14-26 are examined below.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the butterfly valve, drainage channels, shock absorbers, containers for rain water, three piece forgings forming triangles must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Also, the drawings appear to be a copy of color drawings and are unclear with shades of gray obscuring essential components. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. An example is, claim 14, "on the one hand...on the other", claim 18, "like a cage", another example is claim 26, "preferably formed", claim 26, "for instance", etc.

Claim 7, the term "EPDM" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "EPDM" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a

standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

The claims will be examined as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-19, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,751,800 to Kida et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,042,094 to Lee.

Regarding claim 14, Kida discloses a structure having a telescoping roof (figs. 1B & 7) of several sections (fig. 1A) with columns (10) and interconnecting regions (12 & 22). However, Kida does not disclose anti seismic means at the bottom and tops of the columns. Lee discloses a vibration dampening means at the bottom and tops of columns (figs. 5 & 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kida by adding the antiseismic means disclosed by Lee in order to protect the structure from earthquakes.

Regarding claim 15, Kida discloses a butterfly valve which opens the structure in a rotatable manner (fig. 3A & 18: see axial rotation and opening), the rotation inherently causes wind to have less destructive effects and being between the lateral edge of the roof and laterla structural members (fig. 7).

Regarding claim 16, Kida in view of Lee discloses movable structural members, Kida discloses the laterals (40) as received by the support beams (10).

Regarding claim 17, Kida discloses downward channels capable of passing water (fig. 8: 34a) through upright 10.

Regarding claim 18, Kida discloses stationary arcuate beams (17) which cage the upper (17) roof and have channels within (fig. 8: see hollow core) capable of feeding water.

Regarding claim 19, Kida discloses an inherent means of restricting a degree of oscillation throughout the structure.

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Kida discloses the basic claim structure of the instant application but does not disclose specific color orientation of the roof. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed transparent color in order to shine light inside, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the dimensions such as specified in these claims. The roof of Kida also discloses an inherent ability to protect from heat and rain.

Regarding claim 26, Kida discloses I beam elements (fig. 8) with gears and motors for moving the roof.

Claim Objections

Claims 20-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims appear to be drawn to allowable subject matter however, final determination of allowability for the claims will be made after all 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections have been corrected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (571) 272-6846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot, can be reached at (571) 272-6777.

/Basil Katcheves/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3635